

## **REMARKS**

By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 1-35 and adds new claims 36-49. No new matter has been added.

### **I. Objections to the Drawings**

The drawings have been objected because reference character 182, 184, 186, 188 were used to designate both a code reading sensor and a window in FIG. 19. Applicant has amended FIG. 19 and the corresponding section of the specification to address the Examiner's concerns.

The drawings have been objected because the specification refers to arrow X in FIG. 9 which is not found in FIG. 9. Applicant has amended FIG. 9 to include arrow X to address the Examiner's concerns.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn.

### **II. Objections to the Specification**

The specification has been objected for failing to cite the priority claim to an earlier filed patent application in the first sentence. Applicant has amended the specification to address the Examiner's concerns.

The specification has been objected because reference character 12 has been used to refer to a base plate and a guide plate. Applicant has amended the specification so that reference character 12 refers only to a base plate to address the Examiner's concerns.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the objections be withdrawn.

### **III. Rejections under Double Patenting**

Claims 1-5, 7, 13, 17-20, 27-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 45-48, 65-71, and 73-74 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 10/399,754 (“the ‘754 application”). The ‘754 has been abandoned and will not issue as a patent, therefore the provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting should be withdrawn. See MPEP 804(B).

Claims 1-5, 7, 13, 17-20, 27-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of copending U.S. Patent Application No. 11/929,749 (“the ‘749 application”). Since claims 1-5, 7, 13, 17-20, 27-30 have been canceled, this ground of rejection is rendered moot. Furthermore, the present application is an earlier filed parent application to the ‘749 application, which is a divisional thereof, thus the provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection should be withdrawn from the present application. See MPEP 804(B)(1) and (C).

### **IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Since claim 16 has been canceled, this ground of rejection is rendered moot.

### **V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 29, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being non-statutory subject matter for being directed to computer programs not embodiment on a non-transitory machine readable media. Since claims 29, 33, and 34 have been canceled, this ground of rejection is rendered moot.

## **VI. Claim Rejections on Prior Art Grounds**

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 10-13, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,093,103 to McRea, Jr. ("McCrea"); claims 22-26 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,779,546 to Meissner et al. ("Meissner"); claims 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,172,507 to Fujimoto et al. ("Fujimoto"); claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCrea in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,042,150 to Daley ("Daley"); claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCrea in view of Meissner; and claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCrea in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,130 to Kobayashi et al. ("Kobayashi"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Since claims 1-35 have been canceled, these grounds of rejection are rendered moot. New claims 36-49 are patentable over each of the cited references.

Independent claim 36 recites a card reading system including (among other things) "at least one card reader for reading card information from a code printed in UV-luminous ink on a surface of the card, wherein the card reader reads the code by detecting at least two rows of code elements arranged along at least one side on the surface of a card in a card drawing direction, wherein the rows of code elements are stacked inwardly from an edge of the card toward a center of the card and spaced apart from each other." At least these features are neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

Example embodiments of these features can be found at least at FIGS. 3-5 and page 4, line 10-16; page 15, lines 1-12; page 15, line 22 - page 16, line 13; and page 28, lines 4-23 of the present application.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that independent claim 36 is patentable. The dependent claims are patentable for at least this reason, as well as the additional features they recite.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the preceding Amendments and Remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the various objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action is respectfully requested.

No fee is deemed necessary in connection with this Amendment. However, authorization is given to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-1785.

Respectfully submitted,

AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant  
90 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10016  
(212) 336-8000

Dated: New York, New York  
January 22, 2010

By: /Brett M. Pinkus/  
Brett M. Pinkus,  
Reg. No. 59,980